

## THE INTERMOUNTAIN CATHOLIC.

ESTABLISHED 1899.

## The Colorado Catholic

ESTABLISHED 1894.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY BY  
THE INTERMOUNTAIN CATHOLIC PUBLISHING CO.MAIN OFFICE  
Herald Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.  
DENVER OFFICE  
Charles Block, Curtis and 15th St.BUTTE, MONT., OFFICE.  
45 East Broadway.

(SUBSCRIPTION \$2.00 A YEAR IN ADVANCE.)

## Remittances.

Remittances should be made by post-office or express money orders, drafts or registered letters.

## Changing Address.

Subscribers removing from one place to another, and desiring papers changed, should always give former as well as present address.

## Correspondence Solicited.

The Reverend Clergy are requested to send to THE INTERMOUNTAIN CATHOLIC news contributions of interest to their respective parishes.

(Entered in the postoffice at Salt Lake City as second class matter.)

SATURDAY - December 23, 1899.

## A CARD FROM BISHOP SCANLAN.

I feel it my duty to protect Catholics and the public generally from fraud and imposition by notifying them from time to time that no person bearing the name and garb of a priest or sister or any one else is authorized or permitted to solicit or collect in this diocese for any purpose whatever connected with the Catholic church without having from me permission in writing bearing my seal and signature. Should any one be found engaged in doing this unlawful work of collecting without such a document, he or she, as the case may be, should be regarded by all as a fraud and an impostor.

L. SCANLAN,  
Bishop of Salt Lake.

Nov. 20, 1899.

## CHRISTMAS.

The season of Advent is drawing to a close, and that great central festival of Christianity, for which it was a preparation, is approaching, and will have passed ere another issue of The Intermountain Catholic comes from the press. We therefore take this occasion to wish our readers a happy Christmas, that they may enjoy all the spiritual and temporal blessings of this great festival, and that they may live to enjoy them for many years to come.

What a multitude of sacred memories cluster round Christmas Day! How the heart leaps with joy at the contemplation of the glorious event it commemorates! What feelings of gratitude well up from the grateful heart at the thought of that boundless love of God for men, that infinite mercy, which caused the Eternal Son of God to come down upon earth to link Himself by ties of blood relationship with, until then, fallen, helpless humanity!

Eighteen hundred and ninety-nine years ago, a child was born near Bethlehem of Juda, and strange, joyous sounds fell upon the ears of the shepherds who were tending their flocks in the silent watches of the night—sounds that the patriarchs and prophets had longed to hear, but which had not been heard on earth for four thousand years; the voices of angels rejoicing at the birth of man's Redeemer; Glory to God in the highest and peace on earth to men of good will.

Mankind took up the sacred refrain and it resounded through the world and will continue to resound throughout all ages to cheer the desponding heart, till the angel of eternity calls the muster roll of time, and it will continue until it strikes and echoes on the shores of eternity.

Glory to God in the highest, and peace on earth to men of good will.

## SHADOWS OF THE CLOSING YEAR

The year 1899 is fast drawing to a close—a close which is marked by shadows and desolation in different parts of the world.

We are accustomed to boast of our wonderful Nineteenth century progress. In self-complacent mood we look back over the history of ages and pride ourselves upon the fact that we live in an age of progressive enlightenment, the like of which the world has never seen. We frown at the mention of the Middle Ages. Indeed, there is not a past century that we do not look upon with disdain. And yet if we stop for a moment and honestly look back over the history of the past we will have difficulty in finding a period of time marked by more wanton cruelty and bloodshed than that which marks the closing days of the Nineteenth century.

It seems but yesterday that the world looked upon the deliberations of the Peace Congress as marking an era of advancement and good will. Yet scarcely had that Congress adjourned when what is in some respects the most powerful nation in the history of the world takes up arms against an independent and weak nation for no other purpose than to exploit the riches of the weaker nation in behalf of itself.

Queen Victoria's reign is slowly coming to a close. Her sun is slowly setting. Dark and ominous clouds are hovering over her Empire. What a mockery it must be to her at this Christmas time to sing, "Glory to God in the Highest, and Peace on Earth to Men of Good Will." What a mockery it must seem to her to say peace where there is no peace, and proclaim good will where there is only persecution and desolation. Greed has taken the place of good will, and war has taken the place of peace. Victoria reigns over a race actuated by sordid motives, whose sole object is to destroy the weak for the benefit of the strong. All this is a sad commentary on the boasted progress and enlightenment of the Nineteenth Century.

But what could be expected from the Peace Congress, whose deliberations were denied the august counsel and wisdom of the spiritual father of Christendom? Politics dominated the

conference at The Hague, and peace was made secondary to commercial gain.

If Leo XIII had been given an opportunity to be represented at this conference, it is not too much to expect that his wise counsels would have resulted in forming among the members of that assemblage a real spirit of peace.

In the Consistory held on the 15th inst. the Holy Father, in his Allocution, referred to the fact that the Vatican was not invited to send a representative to the Peace Congress at The Hague, omission which, he said, had been caused by all impartial judges.

Continuing, the Holy Father said: "The czar invited the representatives of the most powerful nations, with a view to establishing peace. Yet there was none more worthy of an invitation than the Pope, who had ever desired to attain justice, to make peace and to prevent conflict—an office which the Divine will was willing to entrust to the Pope. The Holy See had desired a place in that conference," continued the Pontiff.

One voice and obstinately opposed itself to his desire and had gained the point. It was the voice of those who, with the conquest of Rome, had deprived the Pope of his powers. "What hostility," asked the Pontiff, "have we to fear from them when, even in the face of Europe, they do not hesitate to violate the sanctity of the rights and duties which naturally flow from Apostolic powers? Nevertheless, whatever the future may bring, we should remember, by God's help, to be found on the side of those who are afraid."

## REMEMBER THE CHILDREN.

Once a year comes the Festival, belonging most particularly to the children. The Christmas-time is theirs. The joy and radiant happiness that glow upon the childish countenances around us are but the reflection of the light which shone upon our own faces years ago. The cares and worries of a soberer age diminish that wonderful happiness which so completely possesses the heart of a child. We have peaceful sweet Christmas, when the child who would go back to babyhood or to boyhood, if he could for the joyous Tule-aid. Let the little ones blow their tin horns and be happy. Noise is an essential accessory to the happiness of children. Remember them well and generously. Let no little heart ache in this merry Christmas time. Small gifts bring joy to the little ones, and acts of kindness to childhood impress themselves deeply on the youthful, impressionable mind, to bear fruit in later years and teach the lesson on generosity and kindly feelings.

Christmas Day we set aside as the time of worship of the Infant Jesus—the Childhood of Christ. Let His little ones, those who were ever dear and beloved of Him, receive our chief solicitude and affectionate remembrance on this approaching anniversary of His birth.

## BULLER'S CHRISTMAS DINNER.

And General Buller will not eat his Christmas dinner in Pretoria after all! Before leaving for South Africa this English Weyler, blood-thirsty butcher that he is and always has been, made affirmation, in a very boisterous manner, that he would eat his Christmas dinner in Pretoria.

But Buller's prophecies, like all other prophecies from English sources, have hitherto failed of fulfillment. Instead of eating his Christmas dinner in Pretoria he will be fortunate indeed if he is not a prisoner there, and in that case the dinner which he would eat in the race course would be quite different from the one which he fondly hoped to eat in the Dutch capital as master of the Dutch republic.

The bragadozia which has characterized Englishmen when speaking of the British-Boer war is quite in keeping with the English character. Buller, after informing his friends of his intentions for Christmas day, calmly added that he would be back in England for Derby day. From present indications he will be more than fortunate if he ever sets foot on English soil again.

Of all the prophecies made concerning this war, it is worthy of note that those which have come from Boer sources are finding literal fulfillment.

President Kruger said that the war would stagger humanity, and his words indeed are being fulfilled every day.

On Oct. 27 last General Joubert, commander of the Boer forces, writing to a friend in Berlin, spoke as follows: "Ever since the infamous Jameson raid of 96 our government was convinced that some despicable characters would urge England to war. Its meaning could not be mistaken. It could have for its sole object only the annihilation of the Boer republic. We were equally sure that we would have to depend on our own resources, for, although we knew that this war would be a struggle for the domination of all European powers, we did not anticipate that any of them would summon strength to come to our rescue. England's arrogance and her sons' greed have caused the European powers that they dare not bid her stop in her depredable land grabbing, not even their own interests are involved. Known to all circumstances, we depended solely upon ourselves, improved our means of defense and tried to keep the English in the dark as to our real intentions. To this purpose, we gave their disguised spies access to our antiquated guns and artillery, but were very careful to conceal from them our modern artillery parks. Our calculations proved correct. The English public credited these misleading reports. Their cry, 'To Pretoria,' is on a level with the Parisian cry of 1870, 'A Berlin!'"

"Your letter lays much stress on the numerical superiority of the English, but my opinion the example is a different one. England has only 35,000 men, while the Transvaal without withdrawing all her troops from the colonies. This in itself is an imposing army, but only of them will be available. Granting that England will have effected the landing of her troops by the middle of December, she will have lost 10,000 through deaths, casualties, desertions and captures. Their number would accordingly be reduced to 25,000. We will not, therefore, be the junior of the English forces under Buller, but even if we should not succeed the English will be unable to put more than 25,000 men in the field against us. The rest will be needed for garrisons and protection of their bases of operations. "The scene of the war will cover Natal and Cape Colony, an area of 700 kilometers. Our own camp is protected by three mountain ranges, and 500 men are amply sufficient for its protection. Our manner of communication is excellent. The outposts have command of all facilities for destroying provisions in case their position becomes untenable. If it were not for the fact that we are carrying out our own country, of which there are no prospects at present, our advantages would become greater yet. For when the fighting unknown conditions in Natal and in the south, we are quite able to make use of the splendid opportunities of defense which our own country offers."

"The enemy will meet a very stubborn resistance in the Transvaal and Orange Free State, and every likely prospect of success is thereby destroyed. You may suggest that we most likely would resort to guerilla tactics. A few months would be sufficient to show to England the impossibility of the task she has undertaken. Her losses will be tremendous."

Those who have followed the history of the war up to the present time will be struck with the accuracy with which General Joubert outlines, in October last, the results of the war up to the present time. That England will eventually win in this struggle does not appear quite so certain as it did some time ago.

## CHURCH "LOOTING" AGAIN.

The Intermountain Catholic has been anxious to reach correct conclusions concerning the "looting" of Churches in the Philippines. That there has been any "looting" for which the United States government or the officers of the United States army could be held accountable, we do not believe. On the other hand, we are now perfectly satisfied that there has been very much more destruction of Church property than we are led to believe by Father McKinnon. Such being the case, condemnation of these acts of vandalism should not be reserved, but should be applied to those who are responsible.

The Intermountain Catholic has taken the position, however, that there are matters of greater import with which the Catholic press and people of the United States may be concerned than the "looting" of Churches, which, in some degree at least, was to be expected when the character of an army of invasion is taken into account.

The property of the Church in the Philippine Islands must be looked, and while the Catholic press is wasting its energy on secondary matters, a clique in the United States is leaving no effort untried to deprive the Church of its rightful possessions in our newly acquired territory.

We are showing much concern over acts of vandalism committed by irresponsible soldiers, but we are showing precious little concern about the spiritual welfare of thousands of Catholic soldiers in the Philippines who are without Catholic Chaplains.

## ENGLISH FEELING ABOUT THE WAR.

The idea current in this country that the masses of people in England view the war with complacency is groundless. The repeated reverses which the British arms have encountered has had the natural effect of making the people resentful towards those whom they consider responsible for the war.

Mr. A. Y. Langdon-Blake, a distinguished Englishman, now visiting in this country, thus sums up what may be considered the real feeling of the English masses concerning the war:

"The feeling of intense resentment is growing in England against the powers that be and those who are responsible for the present war, and for the position in which England finds herself today. To date we have practically won a victory, but only by the loss of the lives of some fresh recruits to our arms. When the storm breaks it will go hard with those responsible for winning the war, but not for losing it. In my mind there is something more than mere personal responsibility to blame. That we have been outgeneraled and outwitted by our enemy, and that we are likely to lose the war, is a fact which is not to be denied. Such fighting as has been done has been done in a spirit of bravado and of a tendency to hold him cheaply, and to my mind, this seems to be exactly what has happened in South Africa."

"But it seems to me that there are one or two unexplained things about the present fight, concerning which I have longingly looked for an explanation. They are, first, how on earth did the English authorities so woefully underestimate the numerical strength of the forces which they were to meet in the field? If the extra numbers of men which the Boers manifestly possess over and above the military authorities' estimates must come from somewhere, how could they leave that country in such numbers without the consent of the authorities there and the consent of the war office at home? And, secondly, how could the Boers have invaded our territory and other weapons of warfare in such numbers, and as they evidently possess, without England knowing anything about it and preparing for the very contingency for which they were so well equipped and which has now come into existence? These are questions which are agitating England just now."

The statement made by some who talk without thinking that by his marriage to a Catholic Admiral Dewey has spoiled his chance ever to be president is utter nonsense. It would help him more than it would hurt him. But he does not want the honor, simply because he is not a Catholic, and is not trained for it; and he may be right.—The Independent.

Our contemporary talks nonsense, and knows it full well. The fact that Admiral Dewey has married a Catholic has taken him forever out of the range of possible candidates for the presidency. Quite naturally the Independent does not want to admit that he is a Catholic, and is so fanatically bigoted as to deprive a man of political preference because of his religion, but it is a fact, and none knows it better than the Independent.

Religious liberty is, of course, guaranteed to all the citizens of the United States by the Constitution, but it cannot be denied that if a citizen's religion happens to be Roman Catholic, the spirit of the Constitution finds application only as far as latent bigotry and fanaticism will allow.

Admiral Dewey, we have no doubt in the world, was as well aware of this fact as anyone else when he married a Catholic wife. On this one point at least the Independent belongs to a religion of the barbarous age.

## THE SISTINE MADONNO AND LA FORNARINA.

The art critics, who for want of something better to do, are spending their time debating over the Sistine Madonna, may read with profit the following from the New York Sun:

People who are not content to accept the old-fashioned traditions concerning pictures and artists, will be pleased by some recent discoveries about Raphael made by the art critics. These ingenious persons have practically exhausted Leonardo da Vinci, who for many years was their favorite quarry, having proved to their own satisfaction that he was not the painter of the Sistine Madonna. They have now turned upon Raphael and the merciless but scientific dissection of "La Fornarina," which is quite only the authenticity but the fame of his Sistine Madonna has been placed in question. The chain of circumstantial evidence, it is true, seems incon-

## SELECTIONS FROM READINGS

## Is There Salvation Out of the Church of Christ?

The Catholic divines admit of but one exceptional case, and that is of what is called "invincible ignorance of the Truth." They say (and they but expound the teaching of the Catholic Church upon the subject) that a person who has led a good life, but has not had it in his power to be rightly informed of the truths preached by Jesus Christ and the Apostles, may be considered to have supplied the defect of actual, visible connection with the Church by his sincere desire to know, and his efforts to find out, and his readiness to embrace the right faith. However, such a one cannot be said absolutely and very sense of the word out of the Church. Although, indeed, he is not a perfect member of the Church, he is considered to be virtually such. His errors (in the supposition) are merely material, and the true faith is what he implicitly wishes and strives to have. With the exception of such a case as this, they unanimously assert with all the councils, that out of the True Church there is no salvation. Protestants exclaim: "What an uncharitable doctrine! A Protestant, then, they say, who is morally an excellent man, is to be hereafter a reprobate, because, forthwith, he is not a Roman Catholic. This can easily be retorted upon Protestants, for, believing, as they profess to believe, that Baptism is a necessary sacrament, and that without it no man can enter into the kingdom of heaven, if they are consistent with their own principles, they must needs confess that an honest Quaker is not in the way of salvation. Such, in fact, is the belief of the Reformed Church. The Church of Scotland, for instance, in her confession of faith, agreed upon by the divines of Westminster, approved by the general assembly in the year 1647, and ratified by act of parliament, speaks thus: 'Catholic visible church, which is also the universal under the Gospel (not confined to any particular people or nation) consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, and of their children, as is the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation.' In the Protestant catechism we find that to be saved by the death of Christ, we must become members of that spiritual society or body of which He is the head, because we cannot partake of the Spirit of Christ, unless we are members of the Body of Christ, and that the Body of Christ is called the Church."

It will therefore be observed that Catholics are found fault with by persons for holding the very self-same doctrine that they do on this all-important point. Let us now examine upon what Scriptural ground rests this doctrine. We read in the Acts of the Apostles (chap. 2). "That all they that believe were praising God together, and having favor with all the people, and the Lord added to their society such as should be saved." To be saved, then, it was necessary to be added to the Church. Again, we have in (Mark. 16) "These be the words of our Lord: 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned.' To be saved, it is necessary to believe, and to believe rightly; because if all sorts of belief were as good the one as the other, if believing agreeably to each person's own conscience were sufficient, the Turks and the Jews would be in the way of salvation. One Lord, one faith, one baptism, says St. Paul to the Ephesians and to the Hebrews; without faith it is impossible to please God; and consequently, if there be but one faith, and if without faith it is impossible to please God, he who does not believe this one faith cannot be pleasing to Him. In the Acts (13th) we read that of the Gentiles: 'As many as were ordained to eternal life believed.' What, then, was the meaning of what Paul and Barnabas had preached to them. They, then, of course, abandoned their ancient belief, or, in other words, such as were to be saved changed their wrong faith into the right one of the truth delivered to them."

The English communion book, printed by authority, orders that one Christendom do and some other festivals, instead of the Apostles' Creed, the confession of Christian faith, commonly called the Athanasian Creed, shall be read. This creed begins: 'Whoever will be saved before all things, it is necessary that he believe the Catholic faith, which faith except every one doth keep, whole and undivided, undoubtably he shall perish everlastingly.' The articles of faith next follow, and the creed concludes thus: 'This is the Catholic faith, which except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved.' After this solemn declaration, who would expect that Catholics should be rebuked by persons adhering to it, as

plete in parts, but the missing links will be supplied by that faith which science often demands no less than legend.

Raphael has the unusual distinction of having had an excellent reputation among his contemporaries. He was a hard worker, and his private life was so uneventful as to excite no comment. This was hardly artistic, so, fifty years after his death, Vasari supplied him with a nameless mistress, a baker's daughter, "La Fornarina," whom the painter saw and loved in her father's garden near the Church of Santa Cecilia in the Trastevere quarter of Rome. It is said that the painter's love for her was so intense that he grew into the well known tale of the painter's passionate love bringing about his early death, and the beautiful, sensuous face of "La Fornarina" in the official gallery at Florence made it credible. Sentimental persons looked on her portrait and then on Raphael's own and had no doubt as to the truth of the matter.

Then came the critics. They proved that it was not Raphael but Sebastiano del Piombo, who had painted the portrait, and that it represented not "La Fornarina," but an entirely different woman, a beauty of Bologna. Their skepticism, however, stopped short of the fact that the painter's love for her was so intense that he grew into the well known tale of the painter's passionate love bringing about his early death, and the beautiful, sensuous face of "La Fornarina" in the official gallery at Florence made it credible. Sentimental persons looked on her portrait and then on Raphael's own and had no doubt as to the truth of the matter.

First, he found in somebody's manuscript, life of Goethe that "La Fornarina" was the same as Margherita, next, in a census of Rome made in 1518, two years before Raphael's death, kept in the Vatican library, he discovered the name of Margherita, Francesco from Siena kept a bakery near the Church of Santa Cecilia; finally, he searched in the registers of the nun-

professing an uncharitable and exclusive doctrine? If all kinds of belief were equally good, or if the right belief not absolutely necessary to salvation, it might reasonably be asked, why did Jesus Christ and His Apostles, after Him, take so much pains to instruct the people and teach them the things they were to believe, and warn them against doctrinal error? Their efforts would have been useless and only calculated to trouble the minds of the people, and cause disunity and so anxious that we should keep our faith pure, he tells us: "If an angel from heaven preach a gospel to you beside that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema." Could he express himself in stronger terms? Does this not prove of what great consequence it is to have the right faith—not any faith? If a gospel preacher (were it possible) even by an angel contrary to that one preached by the Apostles, should become such an abominable how can the followers of Luther and of the minions of Henry VIII and his successors be tranquil? To err willfully is to go out of the road to heaven. In the epistle to Titus St. Paul says: "A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, avoid; knowing that he is such a one is subverted and sinneth, being condemned by his own judgment."

The fact is that he who redeemed us had a right to exact what conditions of salvation he pleased. It is a vain and dangerous curiosity to inquire into the secrets of Providence, to ask why faith and faith in things superior to our understanding is required of us for salvation, we must bow our proud heads and curb our curiosity. The sentence pronounced against heretics (who according to the definition given of the word in a Protestant catechism are they that teach a different faith to that of the Church) is decisive. In the second epistle of St. John is said: "Whosoever receiveth and continueth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God," and St. Paul in his letter to the Galatians, reckons heresies among the works of the flesh, which hinder those who do them from obtaining the kingdom of God. To say, therefore, that heretics, or as Protestants style them, those who teach a different faith from that of the Church, are not in the way of salvation, is the true doctrine.

The Church of England is so convinced that a right belief is necessary, that besides teaching in her catechisms that baptism is necessary to salvation, that to be saved it is necessary to be a member of the body of Christ, which is the Church, she adds in her Profession of Faith: "We are justified by faith only." And in the 18th article declares: "They are to be accused that presume to say that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professes, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law and right of nature; for Holy Scripture doth set out into us only the name of Jesus Christ whereby men must be saved." The Church of Christ begins from Him who is her head. Every Church that has had her birth in later times is not the Church that was built on Peter, is not the Church St. Paul calls the pillar of truth. The true Church could not err, and consequently, could not need reforming. When this was attempted the Catholics might justly address the reformers in the words of St. John: "They went out from us, but they are not of us. For if they had been of us they would not have continued with us."

In conclusion, I would ask if the texts of Scripture are so plain in condemning those who do not believe, if the Apostles have been so anxious to teach the world all the truths they had learned, if St. Paul so strongly recommends to adore every novelty in point of belief, if he declares that without faith it is impossible to please God, and asserts that there is but one faith, if St. Paul inherits the kingdom of heaven, what can excuse the negligence of those persons who, uncertain of the truth of their belief, do not content themselves with following the doctrine in which they were brought up, although their teachers openly avow they have no pretension to infallibility, and therefore, tacitly admit that they may be leading their followers astray?

A good life and invincible ignorance do not without baptism supply the defect of actual visible connection with the true Church. Baptism is the new birth by which we become members of the family of which Christ is the head. One can no more be a member of the Church of Christ without baptism than one can be a member of the human family without the womb of woman. Good intentions and invincible ignorance presuppose baptism.

nery of Santa Apollonia and found there under the date, Aug. 13, 1529, four months after Raphael's death, the name of "Margherita Siena," as having been the name of the convent, as a nun. Therefore this Margherita Luzzi must necessarily be "La Fornarina."

This demonstration was hardly needed by the art critics whose faith in the existence of the Fornarina was unshaken having discredited the official portrait, they looked around among Raphael's other paintings for her features. For a time they inclined to the "Veiled Woman" in the Pitti gallery, but finally settled on the Sistine Madonna as representing the painter's beloved. The evidence for the identification is of the slightest, and, surely the simple, pleasant girl, whose innocence and loveliness into the painter's heart was transmitted to us, might have been left unsmirched. Such as it is, however, the identification is shaken by another art critic. A lynx-eyed young German leonist has cast doubts on the authenticity of the Dresden gallery's treasure and declares boldly that the picture is not the "Madonna di San Sisto," and that in all likelihood Raphael never painted it. His attack is backed by such a display of erudition that the director of the gallery has gone to Italy to find out if there may not be some foundation of truth in it.

While critics wrangle over unessential matters, however, the Virgin, the loveliest creation of Raphael's genius will grace our homes, the most overpowering figure known to the tablets of art.

His Eyesight Good.  
Large Lady—Could you see me across the street, officer?  
New Policeman—Sure, ma'am, it's ten times the distance I could see you.

## THE PAPAL SYLLABUS.

## With a Refutation of the Errors Which it Condemns.

(Translated from the Italian of L. Falconi.)

First Error: Pantheism.—There exists no Divine Being, no Eternal Providence, omniscient and supreme, distinct from the universe: God and nature are identical, and consequently God is subject to change; all things are God, and their substance is His substance; God is identical with the world, and, as a necessary consequence, spirit with matter, necessity with liberty, truth with falsehood, good with evil, what is just with that which is unjust.

Refutation.—The first proposition, which confounds God with the universe, is a palpable absurdity, for since no single part of the universe is necessary, or self-existent, the universe in its entirety cannot be necessary or self-existent; therefore all things are not God.

Such a God would possess contradictory and mutually destructive attributes, viz., thought and extension. Thought is simple and individual, whereas extension admits of division.

Moreover, in the hypothesis, that God and the world are identical, all the existences in the world would be mere modifications of the Deity. Now these different modifications, aside from the fact that they import contradictory attributes in the same subject, would likewise add to the number of God's perfections, inasmuch as they would impart to Him new qualities, new cognitions, and new forms of being. They are therefore repugnant to the Divine Nature, which is in its very idea, infinitely perfect, and can admit neither increase nor diminution. Pantheism is consequently an impudent and brazen absurdity which laughs reason to scorn.

Moreover, as all things in the universe are not necessary, but contingent, that is, indifferent to their existence, or their non-existence, the question naturally arises: Who determined their existence? They did not themselves determine it, before commencing to exist, because action presupposes existence; nor after they came into being, because they were then already in existence. This existence could not, therefore, be determined except by a cause other than and entirely distinct from themselves. If, accordingly, as is manifestly the case, there exists contingent being, that is, being indifferent as to its existence or non-existence, we must, in order to avoid the absurdity of admitting a thing which exists and has not in itself the reason of its existence, or, in other words, an effect without a cause, seek some other cause, which determined its existence, rather than its non-existence.

Now, unless we wish to admit an infinite series of beings producing one another, which is absurd, we must admit a first cause, itself without a cause—a being who exists by necessity of its nature, and who possesses the plenitude of existence, which we call God, living by his own life and substantially distinct from all created things.

The God of Pantheism is not a personal God, as is evident from the proposition above quoted and condemned by the Sovereign Pontiff, who cannot be considered a God at all, since he is continually undergoing the transformations in nature and humanity. Such a God, moreover, does not and cannot adequately account for either nature or humanity when reason, in the assertion of its legitimate right, inquires into their origin and demands an explanation of their constant action and uninterrupted development in space and throughout time.

## WORSHIP OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN.

It is a favorite charge of Protestants that Catholics do and have from time immemorial worshipped the Blessed Virgin. Such charges are, of course, unfounded.

That the early Christians did not worship the Blessed Virgin as a Deity, with supreme adoration, is as true as it is that Catholics never in any age worshipped her in that way. That the early Christians worshipped her with an inferior or relative honor, as a creature wondrously favored by God, is as true as that Catholics have always done so. The infatuation of prelates which leads Protestants to endeavor to obscure the glories of this holy and highly favored creature of God, cannot be explained on any other principle than that they have a misconception of the true nature of the mystery of the Incarnation, in which Mary is the link that unites the Divinity with humanity.

The worship, veneration, reverence, which we pay to the Blessed Virgin, call it what you will, which the Catholic Church pays to the Virgin Mary is founded on the same reasons and motives as that which is paid to the other Saints, with this difference, however, that the worship which is offered to Mary is superior to that given to other Saints, although essentially different from that which is offered to God—as wide apart as the finite is from the infinite.

Saint Irenaeus, who was Bishop of Lyons in the year 177, speaking of Mary, said: "As Eve was seduced by the serpent, so was the Virgin Mary induced to obey Him, that she might become the Advocate of her that had fallen." It is evident from the testimony of this Saint of the second century that Mary was looked upon as an advocate with her Divine Son for His followers. Origen, who lived in the third century, teaches the advantage of praying to the Saints: "I will fall down upon my knees and not presuming on account of my crimes to present my prayer to God, I will invoke all the Saints to my assistance. Oh, ye Saints of Heaven, I beseech you with a sorrow full of sighs and tears; fall at the feet of the Lord of Mercies for me, a miserable sinner." In these words Origen expresses the common faith and practice of his time. This being the belief of the early Christians, they who adorned the Son, would not fail to venerate His Holy Mother, and addressed themselves to her as to a powerful advocate.

When we come to the fourth century, we find the Greek and Latin Fathers of the Church uniting in bearing testimony to the doctrine and practice of

Second Error: Naturalism.—"God does not exert any directing influence over men or over the world."

Refutation.—This proposition is absurd because it denies the providence of God who watches over us, provides for and governs his creatures, more especially those on whom he has bestowed the light of reason. God might, had he so chosen, have refrained from the exercise of His creative power, but to abandon that which He has once created, would be repugnant alike to His goodness and to His wisdom, just as it would argue a want of common sense in the sculptor to take no pains for the preservation of a statue, which he had fashioned from the rude marble and clothed in all the beauties of art. God does not, therefore, and cannot neglect His creatures and least of all man who is the noblest work of His Omnipotent hand; on the contrary, He governs them by His providential attributes, and thus secures the end which He had in view in their creation.

The internal volition of God is identical with its external manifestations, and therefore, the act by which He still preserves the world is not distinct from that by which He willed its creation. Were He for one moment to withdraw His protection, it would be repugnant to the abyss of its original nothingness. His providential action operates directly upon every one of its parts at the same time, that it unites them in one harmonious whole; and though the influence of His guiding hand never ceases to make itself felt He permits each particular body to act as a secondary cause in accordance with the law and properties of its nature, that is matter according to the rules of necessity, animals according to their instinct, and man according to the dictates of reason and free will.

But if God governs and directs everything by His Providence, why is it that moral evil or sin exists in the world?

The explanation of the prevalence of moral evil lies in the fact that God desired the existence of creatures endowed with the attributes of reason and free will, to be governed by the principles of law and not by blind necessity. He desired that these creatures should, by conforming to His law, merit the reward attached to its observance, and He threatened those who violated it with the extreme penalty of His wrath.

It is insisted that, as moral evil is inconsistent with the infinite goodness of God, He should have prevented it, and that He could have done so, while still respecting the inviolability of man's free will.

All things are possible to God, and He certainly might have prevented sin, had He so desired, but such was not His divine will, nor was there any obligation on His part to render man's fall impossible, and why? Because the sole end, which He proposed to himself in the creation, was the manifestation of His own glory. And He secures this end both by the reward which he bestows upon those who observe His law and by the punishment inflicted on those who rebel against His supreme authority. By the graces which He freely showers upon all men, He gives them strength to triumph over temptation; and if they refuse to obey His call and thus bring upon themselves the punishment of their disobedience, He is not responsible for their sin, nor can He be